

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed March 18, 2005. Claims 14-35 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-4 are rejected. In this Amendment, Claim 5 has been amended into its independent form.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art page 2-3 of Applicant's Disclosure.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The discussion in Applicant's Background section did not teach, suggest, or even motivate the element "said first control and said second control are configured such that said first indicator and said second indicator are synchronized to exhibit identical behaviors when said user-touch occurs to at least one of said first control and said second control."

As can be seen from the Background section, Applicant discussed that "these controls typically work separately and independently from each other." "For example, when the power button on the display is activated, the display's LED emits light regardless of the state of the power button of the computer." Applicant also discussed that "currently the display may not be configured to control the power input to the computer system."

With respect to the Examiner's comments that typically when the users turn the computer switch ON or OFF, both the computer, the monitor and their respective indicators are activated or deactivated, Applicant respectfully submits that such teaching did not suggest that the first control and the second control are configured to be synchronized to exhibit identical behaviors when the user touches either the first or the second control. As taught on

page 2, for instance, currently the display may not be configured to control the power input to the computer system. The user may control power input into the display by activating the control on the computer system but the user may not control the power input into the computer by activating the control on the display. Thus, the Background section did not teach, suggest, or motivate the first control and the second control being configured such that the first indicator and the second indicator are synchronized to exhibit identical behaviors when the user-touch occurs to at least one of the first control and the second control.

For the reason discussed, it is not obvious to derive to Applicant's invention as recited in claims 1-4 from the admitted prior art.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-13 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all the limitations of the claims from which they each originally depended. Claim 5 has been so amended. Claims 6-13 depend from claim 5. In view of this amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-13 are now in condition for allowance, and request allowance of said claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Mimi Dao at (408) 720-8300.

**Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY/SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR  
& ZAFMAN LLP

Mimi Diemmy Dao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,628

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

Dated: June 15, 2005